DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 363 SP 004 321

AUTHOR Haberman, Martin
TITLE Teacher Education Is Field Services.
INSTITUTION Association for Field Services in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE May 69
NOTE 16p.; Speech given at 44th Annual Meeting, The Association for Field Services in Teacher Education

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives, *Equivalency Tests, *Field Experience Programs, Public Schools, *Teacher Education, Teacher Role, Universities

ABSTRACT

Extension and field services divisions of universities and new outside agencies will have to be utilized in a new approach to teacher education. Colleges and graduate schools cannot remain the dominating force. Because of the age and needs of undergraduates and the background of college professors, colleges neither help practicing teachers nor prepare undergraduates to enter teaching and to be effective in situations where they are needed. Public schools cannot control teacher preparation either; they can only condition people to cope. Only a new kind of institution, e.g., the cooperative center, can include the necessary components of a sound program: a sequence of field experiences beginning with actual tutoring, then assisting, interning, and finally observing; clinical personnel who actually perform as well as verbalize what they do as teacher educators; preparation of people in cross roles, learning role relationships and expectations during preparation; coordination between industry, schools, professional associations, community agencies, and state departments in a redistribution of power which breaks the axis between colleges and state departments; career-long affiliation between teachers and universities with education of teachers in groups; "selection" process based on first-year performance; preparation of teachers for various teaching functions; and a flexible behavioral approach as opposed to "courses." Students, unions, and community will all gain more control. (JS)

"Teacher Education is Field Services"

by Martin Haberman
Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee

A Speech Prepared for 44th Annual Meeting of The Association for Field Services in Teacher Education

Newark State College, May 5, 1969.

FOREWORD

In his thought-provoking, stimulating and challenging speech Martin Haberman calls attention to the weaknesses and inadequacies of present-day teacher preparation programs as offered by the colleges and universities.

He challenges some basic concepts as to who should teach and how they should be trained. He suggests revolutionary ideas and approaches which can be used to help meet the educational needs of the urban and rural disadvantaged.

Provocatively, he holds out the lure, "Teacher Education Is Field Services!"

CHARLES J. LONGACRE, *President*
Association for Field Services
in Teacher Education

May 1969

Suppose you knew that in 1966-67 five out of six of the teachers prepared in the United States and fully certified in their respective states did not enter the teaching profession, or quit before completing one year. What might you conclude?

Population estimates project 20 million children under five years of age by 1970 and 25 million by 1975. Suppose you knew that in the more than 1200 colleges and universities in the United States that prepare teachers, less than 1200 people were prepared to work with children under six in 1966-67. What might you conclude?

Suppose you knew that approximately 40 per cent of the teachers in Washington, D.C. and in many other urban schools, cannot be lured into taking any college classes; as undergraduates, graduates, or even special students. What might you conclude?

Suppose you knew that on the state level there were thousands of teachers, in New Jersey the number exceeds 12,000, whom the state must certify in order to staff the schools, but who have never had student teaching let alone a full teacher education program. Many of these people want college work but the colleges refuse them. What would you conclude?

Suppose you knew that teachers really learn to teach after they have completed college programs, provided they receive supervision during their first year, but that few colleges, less than 1 per cent, provide any real follow-up for their own graduates. What might you conclude?

Suppose you surveyed the teacher preparation institutions in the United States and found that all the special programs, all the urban MAT's, all the internships for the disadvantaged, all the National Teacher Corps programs, produced less than 2500 new, full-time teachers per year (which is less than half the teachers needed in New York City alone), while the "regular" programs still graduate ten times this number, even though the obvious need is with the urban and rural disadvantaged. What might you conclude?

Because I am the Director of Teacher Education at Rutgers and am aware of my own programs, but to some extent because I do not regard myself as a freak, I will criticize myself on the assumption there is some applicability to you and to your institutions. Rutgers has over 30,000 students and is state supported. We have several thousand students in teacher education courses and we graduate about 500 teachers a year in over 40 different programs. Last year, we had one student teacher in the City of Newark. The same was true for Camden and Jersey City and other places where there is a great need. Students elect where they will student teach and students apply for jobs where they want to teach upon graduation. What can you conclude?

At a recent meeting of our university policy-making council, it was decided that we, a state supported institution, should limit our undergraduate programs to secondary education, in spite of the fact that the need in schools is in early childhood, elementary and junior high school. What can you conclude?

Of about seventy faculty members with whom I work, we have a very small number who have ever taught in public schools and fewer still who seem to remember their experiences. No one to my knowledge has ever taught in a slum school. New professors, with doctorates, have the least actual teaching experience. This situation is equally true in many other prestigious, state supported schools of education. What might you conclude?

And finally, if this mountain of evidence were not available to us, we might simply look at the performance of teachers in urban and remote rural schools and consider the graduates' accomplishments. What might we conclude?

From these ten points, I conclude something very simple, you might say simple-minded, but from these ten contentions, all of which I have some evidence for, I conclude that colleges neither help practicing teachers, nor prepare undergraduates to enter teaching and to be effective in situations where they are needed. I think my friends in teacher education are suffering from a tremendous cultural hang-up; the belief that the colleges and universities in this country prepare our teachers. We have vested in our state departments who have in turn vested only in colleges

and universities the right to offer certified programs. In truth the system is in dislocation and colleges and universities do not prepare undergraduates to teach effectively in places where they are needed. In my judgment there are at least five reasons why we cannot look to colleges and universities for teachers.

The first is that in undergraduate colleges students' needs must trump reality. For example, in our institution it works something like this: a liberal arts tradition equals secondary education since this level of teaching requires only 15 credit hours plus student teaching and it is possible to graduate within four years and get the B.A., teacher certificate package. When Moses came down from the mountain there was an 11th Commandment which you don't know about. Permit me to fill you in. It says undergraduates must finish in four years, not four years and one summer, or three and one half years, or five years, or three years 11 months 3 weeks 6 days, or four years 2 days 6 hours. The 11th Commandment says "Each undergraduate is endowed by the Creator with the inalienable right to a bachelor's degree in exactly four years. And, he must be fully prepared and certified to teach in one of the 50 states in that place to be called the United States of America, within that period." So that teacher education is locked into four years of preparation, for not only completing a bachelors degree but for preparing effective teachers of home economics, French, or whatever.

Now, I don't have to describe undergraduates to you. I think you can conjure up your own visions. Their needs, being human and twenty years old, are something like this: "Will teaching get me out of the draft?" "Can I get a job teaching rather than playing policeman?" These questions do not reflect bad or good motivation. Many of those boys may develop an interest in teaching on the job and a few might actually become good teachers. But their basic work is as a major in history or economics which is merely overlayed with an interest in teaching in order to do something that will delay the draft.

For the girls it is something that Mom expects, or job insurance. The literature, since 1930, is replete with the motivation to enter teaching. But whether these young people begin with honorable or less honorable reasons, or with high or

low motivation, what they begin with has nothing to do with pupil reality. When these youngsters come to our offices to be counseled into teacher education, they have no current concept of school reality. They don't know and therefore cannot care, that schools need primary teachers who can work with other adults, using ungraded materials and individualized instruction; that junior high schools need teachers who can take threats and still teach three or four subjects to disaffected youngsters. College youngsters don't begin to comprehend or feel the problem. They begin where they are; as late adolescent youngsters trying to graduate in four years by majoring in some art or science – and of course, to be fully certified to teach within the same four year period. The trouble is that doing "your thing" as a college kid has nothing to do with the needs of the American public schools. We have two social institutions, the college and the school, running parallel with populations having neither common processes or purposes. Yet, as prisoners of our unrealized expectations, we continue to look to the colleges and universities for our teachers.

The second reason we cannot look to undergraduates is that student control will increase in the future. We "ain't seen nothing" yet. Right now our college lawn is covered with youngsters sleeping in tents. They left their own dormitories to go sleep in the tents to demonstrate for more dormitory space. But what we see now doesn't worry me – yet. The truth is that student activism has just begun. At Rutgers we have a program, called "The Experimental Program", in which students do "their thing" and nobody really knows what "their thing" is. In this case they just register as "experimental" students. If they want to take regular student teaching, they do and if they don't want to, they don't. So far none of them have volunteered for "regular" student teaching. If they want to go to classes, they do, if they don't want to go to regular classes, they don't. So far no one has volunteered. If they want to have speakers come in, they do, and they have had 30 to 40 per cent attendance for these events. They do what they want to for two years, at which point the State Department in Trenton will certify them to teach whatever they majored in. It is a very interesting program. It is completely in the spirit of student activism and student control. None of these students are Black. When the Black students get into this program I predict

there will be definite requirements for all – such as Black History.

I don't believe students who are late adolescents and who have never been to urban or rural schools know what they need to learn. And while this sounds very undemocratic and dictatorial on my part, I don't think they should be asked what they think they need to learn. But because of this trend to pander to activism, a trend which will increase in future, I have no confidence in colleges controlling the preparation of teachers.

The third reason we cannot depend on colleges is that the faculty in most colleges do not know what is needed in schools. For example and again at Rutgers, the President has just initiated a policy which permits open enrollment for six or seven hundred disadvantaged students to come to our campuses as freshman. In surveying our School of Education to find out what knowledge we have as professional educators to help this large number of disadvantaged high school students succeed as freshman, we find very few people who can actually teach them things which will help them to succeed in college. The President can make commitments, however, we cannot implement them.

Early Childhood is another good example. We have one person in Early Childhood; one intelligent person but he has never taught. Colleges and universities hire people who have overly specialized, in self-selected areas of expertise. In future it will get worse since more and more Ph.D.'s are coming through research programs with sophisticated but impractical skills, and with less and less teaching experiences. There is a great difference between research and field research; one is done at a college for an advanced degree, the other in reality for human betterment. We all know which kind is typical.

The fourth reason I have very little confidence in the university preparing teachers is that cooperation between colleges and public schools is very difficult. Brooks Smith et. al. (Wayne State University) did a marvelous survey of ways in which public schools and colleges cooperate. But I think these instances are rare and difficult College students have schedules which conflict with those of the school. Course content is not set up in terms of public school needs. Most of all, youngsters in school don't time their problems to fit student teachers' availability. Children have

a way of needing teachers and other people to work with them, that doesn't fit into final exam schedules, or whether a student has a football weekend, or whether a student is "doing his thing" someplace.

The fifth, is the most important reason for not permitting colleges and universities to remain the dominant force in teacher education. (Again, I am not arguing against colleges and universities having this right; what I am arguing against is colleges and universities being the *only* educational agency permitted to have certified programs.) The age of college students is wrong. Late adolescents are not at the right stage to be placed in a position of nurturing others. They are not and should not be, if they are normal, social service oriented. They should be and are generally concerned about "me". "What's in it for me?" is the response which really underlies many of their idealistic causes. They should be looking for good-looking dates, new experiences, new possessions. Much of what we regard as altruism and idealism is, in my judgment, very selfish and very egoistic, yet very desirable for their stage of development. Their words sound altruistic and "other" oriented, but the emotional valence undergirding these words is otherwise. You can expect to be hit in the head and injured by somebody carrying a sign that says "love, peace, brotherhood."

I would like to recommend a book which I have just been struggling with called *Cognitive Processes in Maturity and Old Age.* (Jack Botwinick) which represents the thinking of many people in this room. This is a summary of research of adult learning. While I don't agree with much of it because it is very pessimistic about what old people can learn, even the author must admit that the evidence indicates that we are most productive and most creative between the ages of 30 and 40. In my own experience of directing intern teaching programs, I have become very skeptical of any one under 25; not only because of the processes that are described in Botwinick's review, but because of their lack of life experiences. I have found that people who have tried several jobs, not failed them, but experienced several jobs, and who have had deep life experiences with other human beings become more effective teachers than late adolescent youngsters.

It is important that we do not preclude anyone's opportunity. The girl who knows since babyhood that she wants to be a teacher should be helped. What I am arguing against is the complete control by the colleges over certification programs. This complete domination foists the wrong-age population on our profession, considering the gap between the nature of youth and the role of the teacher. Consider the research evidence concerning the behaviors performed by teachers; the empathy, the giving, the warmth, the understanding. These are all qualities that develop with maturity, age, and above all, in response to meaningful life experiences. They are not typical qualities of college youth. Qualities of college youth include things like abstract reasoning, emotional and physical stamina, and verbal reasoning. Now, if these were the outstanding qualities of teachers in urban and rural disadvantaged areas then we would be justified in depending on late adolescents. Frankly, these are not the attributes that are most critical for a teacher.

The failure of higher education to solve teacher education problems does not mean, in my judgment, that we should turn teacher education over to the public schools. Public school people have their own hang-ups. They usually assume that more money and smaller classes will solve learning problems. Essentially, teacher education in the hands of public school people would result in accentuating the process of preparing teachers to fit in rather than to be change agents.

Asking educators in general, to improve teacher education is not unlike trying to rescue a ship that is sinking at sea. Just imagine that our ship (the schools) had hit an iceberg and is taking on water. Some "experts" advise us to change the ship's organization and ungrade it; take all the first, second, and third class passengers and mix them up. Or, if ungradedness doesn't help, try individualization; let everybody have his own cabin. Other "experts" say that what we need is a Black captain. (But the ship is sinking!) Well, how about community control. That's it! Why don't we get all the passengers together and have them vote on what they want to do. Other "experts" suggest that what we need is a new philosophy – a better destination. (But look, the ship is sinking!) Other experts sggest that we can differentiate

the functions of the crew and give everybody a title. (But look the ship is sinking!) We are all listening, we are all very much concern, but we are all powerless.

The one clever thing I ever heard Kissenger (President Nixon's personal advisor) say is that the typical American's basic mistake is that he is not realistic; Americans by nature are such optimistic people that they don't recognize when they are powerless. It is a distinct possibility that the school, as we know it, is sinking and that the alternatives proposed for setting it right won't prevent its taking on water.

To keep teacher education under the domination of colleges is to prepare people for the best of all non-existent worlds, while to give teacher education to the public schools is to condition people to cope. I don't see either as a reality solution. What then are the alternatives? Perhaps if we look at some basic components of sound teacher education, we might decide.

The first component of a sound teacher education program involves field experiences – and these experiences should never begin with observation. Almost all teacher education programs begin with observation and that is the most difficult process to teach anyone. Observation is what the most skilled practitioner not the neophyte can do. The surgeon who goes into the arena to watch a colleague perform an operation, is capable of "observation"; if I were to go into the same arena, I would observe very little. Right now there are hundreds of thousands of young people observing in public schools all over the United States who later this afternoon will be coming back and having discussions with their college professors about what they have observed and the college professors will be very upset because the students didn't see enough, or they saw the wrong things, or they jumped to conclusions. The sequence of field experience should run the opposite way; beginning with actual tutoring, then assisting, interning and finally observing.

The second fundamental component of a sound teacher education involves clinical personnel, not college professors; not because college professors are stupid but because they lack relevant experiences. A second reason for de-emphasizing the use of college professors is they are not rewarded for being clinical.

We don't get to be full professors by being clinically oriented; we get there by writing articles and books that have very little to do with the fourth grade. The nature of the situational press acting on a person who is in the role of a college professor is to reward him for not being clinical. The operative reward system is not attuned to faculty members who "waste their time" in the field. This is particularly true in early childhood education. The people who know the most about early childhood are the Directors of Early Childhood Centers. They are women between 45 and 60 years of age who have had 25 or more years actually running centers for young children. But they are not the leaders in early childhood because they have not been "doctorized"; they are not on college faculties. We need clinical personnel, people on the job, to actually perform as well as verbalize what they do as teacher educators.

The third component of effective teacher education is something that can best be done in field services that neither colleges nor other agencies can do — the preparation of people in cross roles. The usual practice is to pigeonhole people: here are people preparing to be elementary teachers; here are people preparing to be French teachers; here are people preparing to be principals; here people prepare to be guidance counselors. When these graduates get to the school they are lumped together and at that point, everybody tries to figure out what his role is. Educational literature is replete, with attempts to define role. The supervisors' association works on role analysis, similarly with administrators, teachers, aides and everyone else. Education is a unique profession. One takes a job and then figures out his role. In fact, you don't even figure it out, you spend your time writing a book about it. This dislocation results from preparation in discrete packages. Teacher education should be and in the future will be, cross role. Therefore, a team won't be three teachers. A team might be a guidance person, a nurse, a science specialist. Preparation will be in teams. During preparation a person will learn his role relationships and expectations by actually working with those in roles that will be cooperating in schools. Imagine taking football players and training quarterbacks in one place, fullbacks in another and linemen someplace else. Who would advocate that they practice separately and only come together

the day they actually play? Well, this is essentially how we prepare teachers and educational personnel. We isolate the people on the basis of narrow occupational lines, which are artificial anyhow, and then place them in their jobs expecting cooperation. Cross role preparation is needed but impossible in college curricula.

The fourth component of effective teacher education programs is coordination; not the artificial cooperation that we now have in student teaching programs. Industry, schools, professional associations, community agencies, the state department, all need real bases for relating to and working with one another. A redistribution of power which breaks the axis between colleges and state departments is needed.

The fifth component is career long affiliation. There has to be some way for the practicing teacher and the other specialists, to have access to the university and to other agencies, on a career long basis. This is not simply for follow-up of graduates – although that is desirable, but the education of teachers in groups. Isolated persons going to an NDEA Institute or even to Newark State or Rutgers will not change the public school. A group of people is needed to do that. In-service education of teachers is built on the assumption that individuals can change social systems, that if you improve what each individual does he'll somehow improve the public school. This is the most monumental, fallacious misunderstanding of human behavior ever perpetrated on a profession. It would be like taking every private in Vietnam and making him more efficient in the hope of solving the general problem. Suppose you are a litter bearer and last week carried 20 bodies to be buried. This week you will carry 40. Suppose you are a cook and make bean soup. This week make 80 gallons instead of 40 and don't burn the beans. Suppose you are a rifleman and killed one Vietcong. This week kill two. If each individual did "more" in his individual job, would the total situation be improved? Do we really believe that? I don't and I don't think you do. But for all the years that teacher education has been operative as a social force, we have made believe that upgrading each teacher, one at a time, is going to accomplish two miracles. It will change and improve the system. By this time we

know that teachers like others, must act in groups before they can change social systems.

The sixth component of sound teacher education involves selection. A good teacher education program does not waste its time in selection. There is no known way, no interview, no written examination, that can predict who will be a good teacher. The selection process should be one year of actual work with youngsters, at the end of which time a mutual decision can be reached based on behavioral performance That is effective selection! Most colleges and universities waste their time in something called pre-student teaching screening; a negative chest x-ray, speech tests, a grade point average. Research not only does not support but refutes such arbitrary procedures.

The seventh component involves new functions. A good teacher education program does not prepare people "to teach." A future-oriented teacher education program might not have the word "teacher" in it. People are prepared to perform as research associates, curriculum specialists, diagnosticians, visual literacy experts, computer system instructors, systems analysts, evaluators, simulation and gaming teachers, professional negotiators, value clarifiers, community organizers, associates in student teaching and teacher education. The global role of "teacher" is no longer functionally feasible. The Education Profession Development Act (EPDA) of The U.S. Office of Education is starting to plan the distribution of its monies for the preparation of much more clearly defined practitioners than "teachers." Field services, over the past years, have helped to clarify the roles of aides, community workers directors and others. "Teaching" should now be broken down into 11, 13, 15 jobs.

The final component of an effective teacher education program is some form of behavioral approach in lieu of courses. The worst thing for field service people to emulate is "the course." If you do that, you are forgetting your heritage. Were Shakespeare alive today some fool in some office would say, "Don't tell me about Hamlet, Othello, and As You Like It. Put it into eighteen weeks of two hours once a week with a final. I don't care if you've got over fifty sonnets, five tragedies and five comedies. It just doesn't fit. If it takes four and ½ hours just to do

King Lear we can't do it. The hours are 6:15 to 8:15 p.m. in Oshkosh. We allow ten cents a mile."

The worst thing about college is that we have a rigid course structure and the worst possible mistake people who direct field services can do is to start imitating the same error and thereby lose their flexibility. Your flexibility should enable you to implement behavioral approaches for learning to teach. These behaviors are not locked up in courses. They don't deal with grades but with on-the-job performance of functions. The present certification system is merely a reflection of the fact that clerks in state capitols can evaluate college transcripts easier than behavioral competencies. You can write courses down on sheets of paper and process thousands of people. It is efficient, easy and systematic. It is also very cheap. Now, some character comes along and says, "Let's look at real teaching, in one of 13 new roles, performing these twenty behaviors." How would a clerk in the state capitol evaluate this? What evidence could we provide to someone in Austin, or Trenton, or Madison, or Columbus, that Joe Smith could really perform these functions? We need people systematically observing, who would file "Certificates of Equivalency." In spite of its inefficiency I am submitting this idea to you in all honesty and in all seriousness. There are effective teaching behaviors which can be demonstrated. When a person has demonstrated these behaviors he is entitled to a license. What field services has that the university doesn't have, is the flexibility of two weeks, four weeks, six months, two hours, thirty hours — to deal with real behaviors.

What kind of institution can include these eight components in teacher education programs? It seems to me that in some places we need a new kind of institution. The University of Maryland has established Teacher Education Centers to train teacher educators in laboratory settings. In other places it may be necessary to establish other kinds of new institutions. Some of these forms are summarized by the TEPS Commission of the NEA in *Innovative Ideas In Student Teaching*, April 1969.

It seems to me that in the future more extension divisions and field services branches of universities will be in an excellent position to get into real teacher education. Not into the off-

campus course work but into the actual establishment of centers which teach. At present the basic hang-up is a belief in courses rather than in behavior because it's easier and cheaper for administrators. What we need are institutions, like field service laboratories, where people can practice their skills and then present themselves when they are ready.

You know the arguments that have been and will be raised against any form of functional approach; for example, "The essence of teaching is a warm, personal relationship. It isn't in the behavior and performance of functions." My answer to that allegation is this. If teaching is human relations, and to a large degree it is, does our course work prepare teachers for that? If we are willing to recognize that real teaching and learning is in large degree determined by how human beings interrelate, how is this accomplished in present training programs? Does "it" happen in History II or in Ed. Psych. I? Of course not. I am willing to concede that I am concerned with only the technical aspects of learning to teach and that these factors may be less critical than "intangibles." I also believe that these behavioral techniques, are what professional service is all about.

Future programs will include more adults in a variety of roles. We will move out of late adolescent education into preparing adults for a variety of roles in reality situations.

I see more student control in traditional college programs. These will be "experimental programs" in which activist types will be "doing their thing" – no grades, no required sequences, no finals or compulsory attendance. These will have little impact on schools but a jarring effect on schools of education.

There will be greater union control in teacher education. Both the NEA and the union already see negotiations including more than welfare considerations. They see the negotiations involving training of teachers and personnel. In the future, a proposal for a grant won't come from the superintendent of schools or the dean of the college, it will more likely come from the boy who represents a college's "experimental program" and the teacher who represents the teachers' union.

I also see much more control by urban ghetto communities.

We face ignorant people taking charge and this doesn't scare me; in many places ignorant people have been in charge for a long while. But we will see community control move into teacher education as well. This means that many aggressive people will demand what's in their own worst interest. But isn't this where field services come in? Community people are going to control things and we are not going to reverse this social force. Our function is to educate people to demand what is in their own best interest. We had a project in Racine, Wisconsin, where we successfully advised militants about what to demand regarding curriculum, teaching practices, differentiated staffing, evaluation of students, teachers and administrators.

In summary, I have contended that colleges and graduate schools cannot remain the dominating force in teacher education. Second, the public schools can't control this preparation either. Third, considering eight components of a sound teacher education program, extension and field services divisions of universities or new outside agencies will have to be utilized. Fourth, that the essence of the new approach will be to utilize behavioral rather than course work criteria. Finally, I have made some calculated hunches about the nature of the forces that will be controlling teacher education in future. Field Services can and should be, the major focus of these changes; whether they are or not depends – to some degree, on those of us responsible for these services.

Martin Haberman